



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Am
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/034,457	12/28/2001	Myung-Won Lee	2080-3-62	9334
35884	7590	04/19/2004		
LEE, HONG, DEGERMAN, KANG & SCHMADEKA, P.C. 801 SOUTH FIQUEROA STREET 14TH FLOOR LOS ANGELES, CA 90017				
			EXAMINER WILLIAMS, JOSEPH L	
			ART UNIT 2879	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 04/19/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/034,457

Applicant(s)

LEE, MYUNG-WON

Examiner

Joseph L. Williams

Art Unit

2879

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 December 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority based on an application filed in Korea on 30 December 2000. It is noted, however, that applicant has not filed a certified copy of the Korean application as required by 35 U.S.C. 119(b).

Specification

2. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: Regarding claim 6, the specification does not disclose the glass glaze is reduced to powder of which the grain size is over 10 microns.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for the barrier rib forming glass having a grain size, does not reasonably provide enablement for the actual grain size. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

In particular, claim 4 discloses that the grain size is 2-4 microns. However, page 14, line 10 of the instant application teaches that the grain size is

to be greater than 2-4 microns. The claimed grain size is smaller than what is disclosed by the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 2, 5, and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sreeram et al. (WO 98 49706 A).

Regarding claim 1, Sreeram ('706) teaches in page 6, line 6-20; page 10, line 9-16, and page 12, line 4-23 and figures 1-4, a method of fabricating a rear plate panel, comprising the steps of forming a complex functional sheet by sheeting a glazing material and a barrier rib material; attaching the complex functional sheet to a substrate; and pressing the complex functional sheet so as to form a barrier ribs.

Regarding claim 2, Sreeram ('706) teaches a step of spraying a glue material on the substrate before the step of attaching the complex functional sheet to a substrate, wherein the glue material forms an interface between the complex functional sheet and the substrate.

Regarding claim 3, Sreeram ('706) teaches the barrier rib forming glass is added to the complex functional sheet with a predetermined ratio.

Regarding claim 5, Sreeram ('706) teaches the glaze material includes glaze glass.

Regarding claim 7, Sreeram ('706) teaches a layer separation occurs between the glazing material and the barrier rib material by a density difference when the complex functional sheet is attached to the substrate (the glaze material is applied as a separate layer and thus is already separated from the barrier rib material).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 4 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sreeram et al. (WO 98/497706, of record).

Regarding claims 4 and 6, Sreeram ('706) discloses all of the claimed limitations except for the particular grain size.

However, Sreeram ('706) teaches the general conditions for the grain size, and since the Applicant has not disclosed any criticality for the claimed grain size, the claimed grain size appears to be an obvious choice in design.

Hence it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the grain size of Sreeram for the purpose of improving the processing of the plasma display.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joseph L. Williams whose telephone number is (571) 272-2465. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (6:30 AM-3:00 PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nimeshkumar D. Patel can be reached on (571) 272-2457. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Joseph Williams

Examiner
Art Unit 2879